UNITED
NATIONS

CCPR

International covenant
on civil and
political rights

Distr.
GENERAL

CCPR/C/SR.1089
17 October 1991

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE

Forty-second session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1089th MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 25 July 1991, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. AGUILAR URBINA
later: Mr. POCAR

CONTENTS

Organizational and other matters (continued)

Submission of reports by States parties under article 40 of the Covenant (continued)

Annual report submitted by the Committee to the General Assembly, through the Economic and Social Council, in accordance with article 45 of the Covenant and article 6 of the Optional Protocol

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Committee at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

GE.91-16926/3812B

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

ORGANIZATIONAL AND OTHER MATTERS (agenda item 2) (continued)

World Conference on Human Rights (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider, with a view to its adoption, the text of the draft recommendations for submission to the Preparatory Committee for the World Conference on Human Rights (a document with no symbol, in English only), prepared by the Working Group on article 40 and incorporating the ideas expressed by the members of the Committee on the original working paper (a document with no symbol, see CCPR/C/SR.1085). In view of the explanations given by the Secretariat and by Mr. Mavrommatis, as to what exactly was expected of the Committee, the original document, which had been very lengthy, had been reduced to a single page. It contained an introduction and five paragraphs which set out the recommendations of the Committee.

2. Miss CHANET drew attention to the reference in paragraph 3 (e) to a redefinition of human rights and international legal notions, especially the enhancement of the idea of the indivisibility of all categories of human rights and of the relationship between human rights, democracy and development. That idea had not been included in the original document and she wondered whether it was an allusion to the positions adopted in the Committee with regard to non-interference. In any event, the formulation was, in her opinion dangerous, if one considered the consequences of an attempt to redefine all the rights set forth in the Universal Declaration or in the Covenants, at the World Conference. In her opinion, a more neutral formulation should be employed which would state that any new factors which affected the definitions or the international legal notions in the area of human rights should be taken into consideration.

3. Mr. LALLAH shared Miss Chanet's concerns. He thought perhaps that the underlying idea in that subparagraph was to encourage the development of ways and means to avoid duplication and to ensure a more effective exercise of the rights recognized by the international community.

4. Mr. MYULLERSON also thought that the term "redefinition" was not a felicitous choice and that the reference should rather be to the gradual development of international standards in the field of human rights.

5. On another point, he observed that paragraph 3 (c) referred to ways and means of improving the existing human rights organs (treaty-based or not); but in fact, the World Conference was required to consider how mankind as a whole and not just the various organs, treaty-based or not, could act to ensure greater respect for human rights.

6. Mr. EL SHAFEI agreed with the previous speakers on the subject of paragraph 3 (e). However, it was also true that there were certain human rights which were still undefined. For example, work was currently under way to define the right to a clean environment. Consequently, that subparagraph should speak rather of continuing to promote human rights and international legal notions. As far as "democracy" referred to in that subparagraph was

concerned, he pointed out that it was an idea that did not have the same meaning for all States and all peoples in the world. The draft should certainly speak of full participation in the conduct of public affairs.

7. Mr. SADI had the same concerns as Miss Chanet regarding paragraph 3 (e). He proposed that no mention should be made of the redefinition of human rights and international legal notions and that the subparagraph should begin directly with the words "The enhancement of the idea of the indivisibility of all categories of human rights, etc.".

8. Mr. WENNERGREN, as a member of the Working Group, explained that the idea behind the wording of subparagraph (e) was to ensure that human rights and international legal notions kept pace with current developments. The subparagraph might speak of "updating" human rights.

9. Mr. HERNDL pointed out that the Committee was supposed, at that stage, to confine itself to suggesting ideas to the Preparatory Committee with a view to the drafting of the Conference agenda. It was only later that the Committee might submit a working paper to the Conference itself in which it could go into more detail. After listening to the other speakers, he thought that the list of issues in paragraph 3 could be shortened by deleting the whole of subparagraph (e). The idea of a redefinition of human rights would be discarded, but the idea of the indivisibility of human rights would be maintained; in fact, it would be discussed with the other topics which would then be developed and expanded in the working document that the Committee would submit to the Conference. That approach should, moreover, be elaborated in paragraph 1, where it was stated that United Nations organs and treaty-based bodies of the United Nations system should participate in the World Conference and its preparatory processes, and that could be done by adding wording such as "including giving written contributions" at the end of that paragraph. Lastly, he proposed that the number of subparagraphs of paragraph 3 should be reduced to five and their order changed as follows: subparagraphs (a), (c), (d), (b) and (f).

10. The CHAIRMAN, speaking in his capacity as the Chairman of the Working Group on article 40 which had drafted the document under consideration, responded to the various remarks and suggestions made by the members of the Committee, beginning with those of Mr. Herndl. Regarding the suggestion that the proposed text should be shortened, he pointed out that the Working Group had drawn on the recommendations made by the Commission on Human Rights to the Preparatory Committee for the World Conference, in its resolution 1991/30, the 11 points of which had been reduced to 6 by the Working Group. The idea that the organs of the human rights system should submit communications or written contributions to the Conference, was already included in paragraph 4.

11. In reply to Mr. El Shafei's comment about the word "democracy" in paragraph 3 (e), he said that, there again, the Working Group had reproduced the language used by the Commission on Human Rights in paragraph 2 of the recommendations annexed to its resolution 1991/30.

12. Mr. MAVROMMATIS said that he would like the recommendations of the Committee to mention the fact that the latter had agreed to be represented on the Preparatory Committee by its Chairman. The agenda of the Conference

should also include items that dealt specifically with treaty-based bodies. Lastly, in paragraph 4 of the document, the verb "turn in" should be replaced by "submit".

13. Mr. PRADO VALLEJO said that he agreed in essence with the comments made by the preceding speakers. Paragraph 3 (e) could be amended, in the light of account the comments that had been made, especially by Miss Chanet and Mr. Sadi, by deleting the first part of the sentence and rewording the second part on the model of subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c), in order to include a reference to the ways and means of enhancing the idea of the indivisibility of all categories of human rights.

14. Mr. NDIAYE said that it was not very clear to him exactly what form the future World Conference on Human Rights was going to take. If it was going to be a conference of experts and technicians, the proposed agenda, with the amendments just submitted seemed appropriate. However, if it was going to be a conference of plenipotentiaries, the recommendations of the Working Group appeared to lack depth of vision or a main idea. The Committee should try to extend the range of the deliberations that would take place in the context of the Conference.

15. Mr. Pocar took the Chair.

16. Mr. SERRANO CALDERA said that he was in favour of keeping paragraph 3 (e), on the understanding that any reference to the redefinition of rights and notions would be deleted and that the remainder of the text would be amended to include a reference to strengthening the links between the various human rights and between the different international legal notions, especially the idea of the indivisibility of all categories of human rights and the relationship between human rights, democracy and development.

17. Mr. SADI said that he thought paragraphs 2 and 5 of the draft recommendations were rather flat and tended to state the obvious, namely that the United Nations treaty-based bodies and the regional and international organizations should be invited to participate in the Conference and in its preparatory process and that regional and international workshops should also be held. He also thought that more should be said in paragraph 3 (a) about the ways and means of encouraging States to ratify human rights instruments; in fact, the words "and to implement them" should be added.

18. Mr. AGUILAR URBINA, Chairman of the Working Group on article 40, replied to the last suggestions and remarks. With regard to paragraphs 1 and 2 concerning who should be invited to participate in the Conference, that was a matter which would not be settled in advance and would be considered by the Preparatory Committee. Recommendations in that regard would therefore not be superfluous.

19. With respect to the proposal to amend paragraph 3 (a), he personally agreed with Mr. Serrano Caldera's suggestion, but pointed out that the wording adopted by the Working Group had been taken verbatim from Commission on Human Rights resolution 1991/30.

20. As to the suggestions made by Mr. Mavrommatis, the one to replace "turn in" by "submit" in paragraph 4 was highly relevant. The fact that the Committee had agreed to be represented by its Chairman could be mentioned in a new paragraph 6. Lastly the idea of including on the Conference agenda, items which dealt specifically with the treaty-based bodies could appear in paragraph 3 (c).

21. Mr. ANDO, who was a member of the Working Group, pointed out that the Group had originally submitted a lengthy document which some had found too detailed. The document had a wealth of lofty ideas which would have met Mr. Ndiaye's concern. The Chairman of the Committee could usefully draw on it and place some of the ideas expressed therein before the Preparatory Committee.

22. Mr. WAKO proposed inserting in paragraph 3 (d) of the document, which referred to the eventual creation of new structures that reinforced the United Nations human rights system, examples of the structures contemplated by the Committee: high commissioner for human rights, institute for human rights, international court of human rights.

23. The last subparagraph (para. 3 (f)), which referred to strategies for proper financing of the human rights structure, was satisfactory, but he would have liked a separate agenda item to be devoted to the need to provide countries with financial, material and moral support for the administration of justice and other national human rights institutions. In fact, some States were not in a position to discharge their obligations because they lacked the material and human resources to do so.

24. Lastly, it would be a good idea to highlight the need for coordination and cooperation between the United Nations bodies which were concerned with the application of human rights standards and their regional counterparts.

25. The CHAIRMAN said that he intended to submit to the Committee a proposal on that very point to the effect that a separate item on the subject should be included on the proposed Conference agenda.

26. Mr. SADI supported Mr. Wako's proposal that examples should be given in paragraph 3 (d). He inquired whether the Council could not also contemplate creating regional offices on the model of UNDP offices.

27. The CHAIRMAN asked the Secretariat of the Committee to insert in the document all the suggestions that had been made so far, and proposed that the revised document should be considered for the last time at the 1,091st meeting.

SUBMISSION OF REPORTS BY STATES PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 40 OF THE COVENANT (agenda item 3) (continued)

28. Mr. MAVROMMATIS reminded the members of the Committee that he had been instructed to contact representatives of the States parties whose reports to the Committee had been long overdue. Whenever possible, he had made a point of meeting the permanent representative of the State in question.

29. The Committee should not expect the reports of Jamaica, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea or Afghanistan for several months. The Government of Senegal had submitted its third periodic report. Senegal was a typical example of a country which had the necessary ability as well as the will to discharge the obligation to submit a report but which faced problems because there were so many reports to be submitted. Tanzania was in the same position and its ambassador had taken steps to ensure that the report reached the Committee. In the case of the Central African Republic, the country did not even have an ambassador in New York and for the past several months the Permanent Mission had received no further instructions from the Government. It was obvious therefore that the Committee could not expect anything from that country in the near future. The Permanent Representative of the Republic of the Congo had made a veritable appeal for help in preparing its reports. He had explained to the Permanent Representative of Kenya that the supplementary report sent by his country did not meet the Committee's requirements. Some countries would certainly make a formal request for the report submitted by them to be regarded as constituting their second and third periodic reports. Guinea had submitted a periodic report; he wished to point out, however, that he had been able to meet the Permanent Representative of that country and of that of Equatorial Guinea only during the General Assembly. In fact those countries as well as others were so poor that they were no longer able to afford the upkeep of a permanent mission.

30. It would therefore seem that many third world countries were confronted with insurmountable difficulties in preparing the large number of detailed reports required of them under various international instruments. The Committee should show understanding and at least find ways and means to assist States in preparing their reports. It should also determine the status and the exact nature of a supplementary report. If the Secretariat considered that further contacts were necessary and if the Committee so decided, he was perfectly willing to continue his efforts.

31. Mr. WAKO thanked Mr. Mavrommatis for drawing attention to the difficulties that some countries were facing. It seemed important to him that when deciding on the procedure to be followed in the future, the Committee should adopt a decision that took into account the difficulties encountered by the developing countries but was not likely to detract from the Committee's authority to ask States to comply their obligations. The permanent representatives or the members of missions were endeavouring to ensure that their Governments prepared the requisite reports, but some countries quite simply lacked the means to do so.

32. In the case of Kenya, he had tried to ascertain the cause of the delay in the submission of his country's periodic reports and had concluded that, as with other developing countries, the reason was the lack of resources, particularly of staff. However, measures had been taken to rectify the situation but it was hardly likely that the overdue report would be submitted before 1992.

33. The CHAIRMAN thought that the Committee could take a decision on the matter at its autumn session.

34. The Committee should now take a decision on the subject of the third periodic report of Madagascar, which should have been submitted in 1988. The second periodic report of Madagascar had just been examined. As in a certain number of other cases, the officers recommended that at least one year should be allowed to elapse and the deadline for the submission of Madagascar's third periodic report should therefore be set for December 1992.

35. Mr. NDIAYE thought that the events occurring in Madagascar were of sufficient importance for the Committee to take a specific decision on the case of that country. It would be preferable to wait until all the transformations currently taking place had been completed. The Committee would run the risk of hearing a statement on plans and aspirations whereas it was interested in concrete situations. A period of two years would be more reasonable.

36. Mr. MAVROMMATIS agreed with Mr. Ndiaye. However, as Madagascar had declared a state of emergency, he thought that the Committee should follow events and keep the situation under observation during the entire period of time agreed.

37. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, if the Committee agreed, the deadline should be set for December 1993.

38. Mr. SADI thought instead that when a country encountered difficulties of that kind, the Committee had an additional reason to ask for a special report, at least in order to describe the emergency measures adopted. That was what the Committee had done in the case of Iraq.

39. Miss CHANET shared Mr. Sadi's view, as she was anxious that the Committee should avoid incurring the accusation of partiality. Contact should be maintained with countries which had declared a state of emergency or were facing an emergency situation. In that regard, the Committee would also have to express an opinion on the case of Yugoslavia, whose third periodic report was scheduled for 3 August 1988, and it should also settle the question of the two Germanys.

40. Mr. NDIAYE said that he could only agree with the principle. However, he reminded the Committee that Iraq had only agreed to submit a special report in order to come before the Committee and plead a different cause for other reasons. The Committee could, of course, repeat the experiment and ask a country for a report knowing full well that the latter was unable to do so: it would then receive a report that was not a report. When it was faced with an unusual situation, the Committee should rather take duly into consideration the exceptional nature of the situation and set the deadlines accordingly.

41. Mr. LALLAH proposed that the Committee should wait until the October session before asking Madagascar for a report. Things would probably have evolved to a point where the Committee would at least know to which Government it should make its request. As far as he was concerned, a two-year time frame would be acceptable.

42. The CHAIRMAN said that he thought that it would better not to take any decision before the forty-third session.

43. It was so decided.

44. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that at is October session, the Committee would consider the third periodic reports of Ecuador and Poland and the second periodic report of Austria, as it had decided at its forty-first session. It would also have to consider the periodic reports of Morocco and Iraq. To those five reports, the Committee could add the initial report of Niger, which should have been submitted in 1987. If any of the States parties stood down, the third periodic report of Mongolia could be examined.

45. Mr. MYULLERSON said that he agreed with the suggested timetable, but wished to point out that the representatives of the Byelorussian SSR, whose third periodic report due in 1988, had now been received, had said that they wished the report to be considered in Geneva, and quickly.

46. The CHAIRMAN, in reply, said that the case of Mongolia was similar. The Committee had to set aside eight meetings for the consideration of communications and, in view of the remainder of its agenda, which was heavy, it could not schedule the consideration of more than six reports. Of course, the Committee could keep the third periodic report of the Byelorussian SSR in reserve if there were any withdrawals.

47. He said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed with that timetable.

48. It was so decided.

49. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the subject of the general guidelines of the Committee, one paragraph of which should be recast in order to take into account the adoption of uniform guidelines for the first part of the reports, said that it would be enough to add a paragraph stating that the general part of the report must be prepared in accordance with the uniform guidelines.

50. If there was no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to entrust the Secretariat with the task of drafting that paragraph.

51. It was so decided.

ANNUAL REPORT SUBMITTED BY THE COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, THROUGH THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL, IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 45 OF THE COVENANT AND ARTICLE 6 OF THE OPTIONAL PROTOCOL (agenda item 6)

52. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to adopt the draft annual report to the General Assembly (CCPR/C/42/CRP.1 and Addenda), on the understanding that any amendments of form would be subsequently made by the Secretariat.

53. Mr. ANDO (Rapporteur) pointed out that different parts of the draft report were not yet available in all the working languages of the Committee.

54. Before the Committee considered the report chapter by chapter, he wished to make a proposal. He understood that the suggestion had been made some time earlier that the names of the representatives of the States parties who had participated in the consideration of the report of their country should be listed and attached as an annex to the report. Opinion had been divided on the matter, and therefore the Committee had not taken a decision. He thought that now that the situation had evolved, the Committee could reconsider that proposal.

55. Miss CHANET said that she would be grateful if the Secretariat could be kind enough to inform the Committee of the practice of other human rights bodies in that regard.

56. Mrs. KLEIN (Secretary of the Committee) said that only the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights attached to its report to the Economic and Social Council a list of the members of delegations of States parties who had been present when their countries' reports were being examined.

57. Miss CHANET thanked the Secretariat for the information and added that it might, in fact, be useful if the list of the delegations of States parties appeared as an annex, if only to indicate the high level of certain representations. In that connection, she cited the recent examples of the Soviet Union, India and Sri Lanka. Similarly, when certain incidents occurred during the consideration of a State party's report it might be helpful to know what was its level of representation.

58. Mr. HERNDL said that he fully endorsed Miss Chanet's suggestion. Furthermore, by listing the names and titles of the members of the delegations of States parties, the Committee could hope that other States would follow the example of those which had sent representatives of a very high level.

59. The CHAIRMAN said that he understood that the Committee wished a list of the members of delegations of States parties present during the consideration of their countries' reports to appear in an annex to its annual report. That annex could also be mentioned in section B (Consideration of reports) of chapter III (CCPR/C/42/CRP.1/Add.2). He suggested that a sentence should be added to paragraph 13 of that section indicating that a list of representatives of States parties whose reports had been examined appeared in an annex.

60. Mr. SADI observed that the authorities of States parties rarely read annexes. If the purpose of the proposal was really to reflect the extent of States parties' commitment to the Covenant, it should highlight the level of representation of those States, and provide the information in the body of the report itself. The level of a delegation would also be a measure of the interest of the State party concerned in the work of the Committee.

61. The CHAIRMAN said that he gathered that Mr. Sadi wished the names and titles of the members of delegations to be indicated in the respective sections dealing with the consideration of the reports of States parties. In fact, the authorities of the States parties hardly paid any attention to the annexes. However, if all the names and titles of their representatives appeared in the same annex, an immediate comparison could be made of the levels of representation of the various delegations.

62. Mr. ANDO (Rapporteur) said that he agreed with the Chairman. The Committee could, in fact, adopt a different strategy, which would consist of publishing the list of the delegations in an annex which would, in any case, be placed at the beginning of the general part of the report that dealt with the reports submitted by States parties. In his opinion, the Committee could adopt that solution as a temporary measure and perhaps reconsider its decision at a later date.

63. The CHAIRMAN said that he assumed that the Committee wished the names and titles of the members of the delegations of States parties present during the consideration of their country reports to appear in an annex to its annual report.

64. He invited the Committee to consider the draft report chapter by chapter.

Document CCPR/C/42/CRP.1

65. Mr. ANDO (Rapporteur) pointed out that in the document the usual layout for chapter I had been used. He recalled that at its last session the Committee had taken a special decision on the subject of Iraq which was reflected in paragraph 18 of chapter I (CCPR/C/42/CRP.1) and, at greater length, in paragraph 11 of chapter III (CCPR/C/42/CRP.1/Add.2).

66. Mr. HERNDL said that he wished to raise an issue which was of particular importance to him and he was certain that the other members of the Committee would share his point of view. The issue was the Committee's Yearbook. The decision to publish it had been taken after lengthy discussion in the early eighties. The latest volume published (1983-1984) had just appeared, in English only for the moment. He was deeply grateful to the Secretariat for its efforts in producing it. In his opinion, the Committee should state in its annual report, that it was very anxious for the publication of the other volumes of that Yearbook to be speeded up, in order to clear the backlog. The Committee should indicate in its report that it wished the Yearbook to be issued regularly, and on time and considered it to be an extremely important work tool. With that in mind, he proposed that a new paragraph should be added after section G (Other matters) of chapter I. The paragraph could read: "Having noted with appreciation the recent issuance of volume I (in English) of the Committee's Yearbook 1983-1984, the Committee expressed the wish that work on the Yearbook as the official report of the Committee be accelerated and that the existing backlog be eliminated as soon as possible and that henceforth the volumes be issued on a regular and timely basis in English and French".

67. Mr. ANDO (Rapporteur) said that he personally agreed with Mr. Herndl's proposal. He had himself already asked the Secretariat what could be done to speed up the process of publication. From all appearances, the problem was one of money and staff. To remedy that situation, he suggested that a private Japanese foundation should be approached. The United Nations had, however, laid down very strict rules about soliciting private financing. Steps were currently being taken to try and find a solution but for the present, the Secretariat shouldered full responsibility.

68. Miss CHANET said that she fully supported Mr. Herndl's proposal. On account of the backlog, the Yearbook was not yet a useful working tool. The Committee should therefore endeavour to remedy that state of affairs. Besides, the subject of publications would probably also be discussed at the World Conference on Human Rights to be held in 1993. At that time, the financial aspect could perhaps be examined and possible arrangements for the modification of certain rules concerning budgets could be discussed to enable private funds to be solicited, if necessary, in order to produce certain publications.

69. Mr. PRADO VALLEJO welcomed Mr. Herndl's proposal and thought it very timely. He earnestly hoped that the Committee would find backing for publication of the Yearbook. He wondered, however, whether its publication in English and French only was based on a principle. In his opinion, it should be issued in all the working languages of the Committee. If that was not possible at the present time, for technical or financial reasons, the Committee should be careful not to rule out the possibility of its subsequent publication in the other languages.

70. Mrs. KLEIN (Secretary of the Committee) pointed out that the summary records of the meetings as well as the annual report of the Committee were available in all working languages. She recalled that when the decision had been taken to issue the Yearbook, the Committee had agreed to do so only in English and French because it lacked sufficient resources. Its publication in Spanish could of course be envisaged, but the decision would depend on the financial situation.

71. Mr. PRADO VALLEJO thanked Mrs. Klein for her very useful reply. The key issue, in his view, was to avoid ruling out future opportunities. He therefore supported Mr. Herndl's proposal, subject to the reservation that it would be amended in order to avoid giving the impression that the Committee had decided once and for all that the Yearbook would be published only in English and in French.

72. Mr. HERNDL said that he felt that the deletion of the words "in English and in French" in his proposal was fully justified and would leave it to the Secretariat to draft a new sentence with a suitable wording.

73. It was so decided.

74. The CHAIRMAN observed that, unlike the preceding annual report of the Committee, chapter I (CCPR/C/42/CRP.1) did not contain a section on the promotion of the work of the Committee. However, the matter was an important one, especially since the Committee had given several press conferences during the year. He failed to understand why such a section was not included in the draft report.

75. Mr. ANDO (Rapporteur) said that there had been an oversight. The Secretariat would instructed to correct the error and draft a new section on the subject, which would be inserted immediately after section H (Future meetings of the Committee).

76. It was so decided.

Document CCPR/C/42/CRP.1/Add.1

77. Mr. WENNERGREN, referring to paragraph 4 of the document, pointed out that, during the session, the Committee had changed its opinion about the comments and recommendations that should be submitted to the Preparatory Committee for the World Conference on Human Rights. Accordingly, he was proposing that the word "particularly" should be deleted from the third line and that the word "preliminary" should be inserted in the fourth line before "recommendations".

78. Document CCPR/C/42/CRP.1/Add.1, as orally amended, was adopted.

Document CCPR/C/42/CRP.1/Add.2

79. Mr. ANDO (Rapporteur) indicated that paragraph 12 should also state that the Committee had received the second periodic reports of Luxembourg and Peru.

80. Document CCPR/C/42/CRP.1/Add.2, as orally amended, was adopted.

Document CCPR/C/42/CRP.1/Add.3

81. Mr. ANDO (Rapporteur) pointed out that the phrase "what was the status of the decisions" in the twelfth line of paragraph 5 should be replaced by the phrase "what was the effect of their decisions". The second sentence of paragraph 21 should also be amended to read: "The competent authorities were currently giving careful consideration to the Second Optional Protocol in the light of the National Defence Act, with a view to possible accession to the Protocol, etc.". Regarding paragraphs 54 to 57, he thought that it might be preferable in the future, to change the heading "General observations" to a less subjective formula.

82. The CHAIRMAN agreed with the Rapporteur on the latter point and proposed that the members of the Committee should think about a formulation such as, "Concluding observations by Committee members" for example.

83. Miss CHANET pointed out a mistake in the last sentence of paragraph 57 in the French version; the beginning of the sentence should read "La discussion avec la délégation canadienne ...".

84. Document CCPR/C/42/CRP.1/Add.3, as orally amended, was adopted.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.